

Appl. Ser. No.: 09/844,635
Atty. Docket No.: 12001-105
Reply to Office Action dtd. 05 May 2005

disclosed by Ross' MESHER, discussed at col. 6, ll. 43-65, and col. 11, ll. 20-64, and illustrated in Figs. 5 and 9A-D. Applicants respectfully disagree. Ross discloses in MESHER a means to generate surface models of 3D objects, represented by poly-mesh, and thus graphics 3D solid objects from a volumetric image data set, and provides a means for cutting an object and connecting the outer and inner surfaces (termed layers) of the same object to convert it to a 3D solid object. This is not the same concept as layers created by individual independent poly-mesh objects inside another, as recited in claims 1-2. In Applicants' system, a layer representing an object also has outer and inner surfaces.

(i) In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that Ross fails to teach or suggest the inventive methods recited in claims 1-5, and therefore request reconsideration and withdrawal of both the §102(e) and §103(a) rejections of said claims. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-5 are now in a condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If any questions arise during the review of this amendment/reply, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (617) 854-4000 to discuss any issue.

Respectfully submitted,

BHARTI TEMKIN, et al.,
Applicants

Date: September 6, 2005

By: John A. Hamilton
John A. Hamilton, Reg. No. 48,946
Attorney for Applicants

Kim

12001-105_RespD_090605